

## **Historic, archived document**

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.



## AMENDMENTS TO AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

---

JUNE 15, 1906.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

---

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on Agriculture, submitted the  
following

### VIEWS OF THE MINORITY.

[To accompany H. R. 18537.]

The undersigned minority members of the Committee on Agriculture, to whom were referred the Senate amendments to the bill (H. R. 18537), making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907, are unable to agree with some of the important provisions of the majority report, in so far as Senate amendment No. 29, commonly known as the "Beveridge amendment," is concerned.

Without going into detail as to all of the provisions of the committee's substitute to the so-called "Beveridge amendment," many of which we are in accord with and with numerous others we dissent from, it is our desire by this report to emphasize our position upon some of what to us are considered very important propositions.

First, we state our desire for the enactment of a law that will produce the best possible inspection of all meat and meat food products that are consumed not only by our own people, but by all the people of the world who consume the same, and we wish to say that many of the provisions of the so-called "Beveridge amendment" and many of the provisions of the committee's substitute tend toward this end, and which we heartily commend.

The first proposition, however, that we desire to call attention to is the cost of this much-needed inspection, and upon whom this burden or expense shall fall. We desire and believe a sufficient amount of money should be appropriated in the first instance by the Government in order to fully meet all possible demands, and that this appropriation, be it \$2,000,000 or more for this purpose, should be made at this time, and it should be permanent, in order that the service might not hereafter be crippled in any manner. In this connection we wish to emphasize the fact that while we are protecting the consumers of these products, yet the stock producers of this country should also



receive at the hand of the Government as great protection and encouragement as is possible. The stock raised by our farmers are the natural products of the soil, and are one of the main food products consumed by our people. Hence it should be the duty of the Government to see to it that this food product, at least so far as the ante-mortem examination of the animal and the post-mortem examination of the carcass are concerned, should be borne by the Government, and that ample funds should be provided for this inspection in all cases.

This having been provided for and this inspection properly made, we contend that when the food carcass is thus put in shape for consumption, that thereafter any change of this carcass into food products of any kind by any slaughtering, canning, salting, rendering, or manufacturing concern, thereby necessitating further inspection of this product in its manufactured form, should be borne by the individual, company, or corporation producing this change and manufacturing this food product. Therefore, for the purpose of reimbursing the Treasury, all expense incurred in consequence of this manufacturing process should be borne by the packers or manufacturers in the following manner:

That the Secretary of Agriculture shall ascertain as near as may be the total amount of such expense and fix a charge or fee upon each carcass, or part of carcass, thus transformed into meat food products by any person, firm, or corporation engaged in the manufacture of such food products, sufficient to defray such expense, and that the same be collected by the Secretary of the Treasury and deposited in the Treasury of the United States; that such charge or fee should be uniform throughout the United States, and be of sufficient amount only, as near as can possibly be ascertained, to meet this expense.

It will be seen by the foregoing that it is the desire of the undersigned to absolutely protect the stock raiser from any charge or expense whatever, and that after the animal is slaughtered and found to be healthy and sound for food purposes, only those who cause a change in the carcass should be responsible for subsequent cost and the expense of inspection.

The undersigned further say that in view of the statement made by Doctor Melvin, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, that the expense of the inspection contemplated by this act may, in his judgment, exceed \$3,000,000, we therefore suggest that if this expense shall be borne by the Government, the contemplated appropriation in the committee's substitute of \$2,000,000 be increased to at least \$3,000,000; and that in case it shall be determined that this expense shall be borne by the packers, or otherwise, then, and in such case, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed to prescribe and fix reasonable fees for the inspection and examination of all cattle, sheep, swine, and goats, and meat and meat food products thereof, maintained in accordance with the provisions of this act, which fees shall be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture at a rate which as nearly as possible will serve only to defray the cost of said inspection and examination, and the said fees shall be uniform throughout the United States and shall be collected by the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be deposited in the Treasury.



The next proposition we desire to call attention to is the paragraph in the committee's substitute providing for a broad court review concerning all matters which come under the supervision of the inspectors or the Bureau of Animal Industry, in so far as the inspection of meat food products is concerned or contemplated by this act. In our opinion this broad court review is unjustifiable and should be eliminated entirely. The inspection of food products is a matter which should be confined to the executive branch of our Government and it is not a subject for the judicial department. Constitutional rights of persons and of their interests in property is guaranteed to every citizen and can not be withheld, yet a review of matters which are purely executive and which rest in the executive branch of the Government, in our judgment, should remain where the Constitution contemplated they should, and we believe that this broad court review in a measure of this kind is an unnecessary and dangerous departure from the policy and practice of our Government and would materially cripple the efficiency of the inspection service contemplated by this act.

Again, we are opposed to that provision in the committee's substitute which seeks to nullify the civil-service law for one year in the appointment of inspectors who are to aid in the carrying out of this act, and we deem this nullification vicious and that it should not be incorporated in this bill.

The information of the undersigned at this time is that an adequate force of inspectors, competent in all ways to perform the duties imposed upon them by this bill, can be provided for under existing law without the necessity of wiping out this statute for any considerable period of time.

In making this minority report we wish to emphasize and again repeat the fact that in our judgment either the Beveridge amendment or the committee's substitute contains many good and substantial provisions which will materially aid in producing better and purer food for our people, and that our only purpose in making this minority report is to call the attention of the House and the people of the country to what, in our judgment, would materially strengthen this much-desired law should either the so-called "Beveridge amendment" or the committee's substitute therefor be enacted into law.

In our opinion, however, the so-called "Beveridge amendment," on the whole, with some slight amendments, would be more effective in producing the results desired than the proposed committee's substitute.

G. N. HAUGEN.  
C. R. DAVIS.

